

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/053,116	SCHULTZ ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Daniel P Stephenson	3672	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** abandoned

 (1) Daniel P Stephenson.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Arthur Navarro.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 14 October 2003
**Time:** 10:00
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**
*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was related to the attorney for the applicant, Mr. Navarro, that since no reply had been filed for the action mailed out 3/26/03 the case was going abandoned. Mr. Navarro contended that no action had been received. The examiner informed Mr. Navarro that a petition to withdraw holding of abandonment could be filed in that case, as shown in MPEP 711.03 (c) II.